

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action dated May 4, 2004, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

The rejection of claims 14-24 and 26-31 as anticipated by Gosnell is respectfully traversed for the reason that the novel armor assembly defined in these claims is not disclosed in the applied reference.

The armor assembly according to the present invention differs from the composites disclosed by Gosnell in two important respects: the assembly according to the invention includes an armor layer that is made of PMMA or epoxy resin; and the armor layer is slanted relative to the expected trajectory of an oncoming projectile and constitutes means for deflecting the projectile from its original course. Gosnell does not disclose either of these features.

According to the first distinguishing feature, each armor layer, i.e. each layer that acts to divert the trajectory of a projectile from its original course, in an assembly according to the present invention, is made of PMMA or epoxy resin. In contrast, in the devices disclosed by Gosnell, all of the layers that absorb bullet impact forces are made of glass. While the reference does disclose the

provision of layers of polymer and other plastic materials, these are not armor layers in the sense that they are not disclosed as contributing in any measurable way to absorbing impact forces. These layers are, for the most part, described as being very thin (column 2, line 14).

The layers 32 and 34 shown in Figure 3 of the referenced drawing have surfaces that are perpendicular to the bullet trajectory. That those surfaces have such an orientation is clear from the disclosure at column 1, line 35-45 of Gosnell, wherein it is stated that at least one major plane surface of the high modulus material is at an acute angle to the outer surface of the composite. A related statement appears at column 2, lines 11-14, wherein it is stated that the high modulus material is in the form of thin glass sheets 10 disposed at a 45° angle with respect to the surface upon which the bullet impacts. These two statements clearly establish that the armor has a front surface that is perpendicular to the direction of bullet impact. The surfaces of layers 32 and 34 are parallel to that front surface and therefore are not slanted relative to the expected trajectory of an oncoming projectile and do not constitute means for deflecting the projectile from its original course.

Appln. No. 09/904,585
Amd. dated August 2, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2004


In other words, the plastic layers of Gosnell can not be compared with the armor layers defined in application claim 14.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably over the prior art of record and it is therefore asked that these claims be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\cohn\yeshurun3a\PTO\AMD 2AUG04.doc